

Planning Objection – Proposed Development of 600 Dwellings, Tattenhall

The impact that this proposed development will have on our quality of life is profound, and unsustainable and therefore I object to the proposed development of approximately 600 dwellings in Tattenhall on the grounds of transport impact, infrastructure capacity, and sustainability and resident safety and security.

Background to Objection

Given that there are very limited employment opportunities in the village and that therefore residents will have to commute, using industry standard traffic and planning factors, the impact of 600 additional dwellings implies:

Population increase of between 1,260 – 1,575 people (60%) an additional 780 – 1,200 vehicles resulting in an additional 2,400 – 3,600 trips/day. This will have an impact on commuting patterns and traffic capacity and concentration in particular on school / peak time, village centre congestion and access to the A41.

1. Traffic Impact and Highway Safety

The proposed development is expected to generate approximately 3,000 additional vehicle movements per day, with an estimated 200–280 additional vehicle movements during peak hours.

The Plan assumes that walking to school and the village centre will mitigate congestion however, this is an unrealistic assumption especially as for example parents prefer to drop children off on their way to work, sadly children walking to school is a modern fallacy.

The challenge for traffic on Frog Lane and Rocky Lane is not the volume of traffic but of the roads themselves being narrow, with blind bends and high hedges and being used by large agricultural vehicles and tankers. Inevitably any increase in traffic will increase the risk of accidents. The plan appears to have missed the real issue; the primary access routes from Tattenhall to the strategic road network is via the A41. These junctions are already reported to experience congestion, queuing, and safety concerns, especially since the A41 is a major route for lorries going to the ferries at Holyhead.

it is the intersections with the A41 where a small increase in traffic volume will significantly impact traffic flow and density as well as increasing the accident risk. This must be addressed within the plan as it is a significant consequence.

Based on standard rural junction capacity assumptions, the A41/Chester Road junction is likely to operate at or near capacity at peak times. The addition of traffic from 600 dwellings alone would exceed this capacity, resulting in:

- Sustained peak-time queues (estimated 20–40 vehicles)
- Increased delays (2–5 minutes average, up to 10 minutes at peak)
- Reduced gap availability for safe right turns onto the A41

- Increased risk of collisions due to driver frustration and limited visibility

This represents a clear and unacceptable impact on highway safety.

2. Unsustainable Scale of Development

A development of 600 dwellings would increase the population of Tattenhall by approximately 1,420 (61%) (ONS standard planning assumption) This scale of growth is disproportionate to the size and infrastructure capacity of the village.

The scale and layout of the proposed development raise concerns regarding community safety and crime prevention.

A development of up to 600 dwellings would significantly increase the number of vehicles and properties, which is typically associated with higher levels of opportunistic crime such as theft from vehicles and property.

In addition, large edge-of-settlement developments such as proposed create areas with reduced natural surveillance and multiple access points, increasing vulnerability to anti-social behaviour and low-level criminal activity.

Given the limited policing presence typical of rural areas, it is important that the design of the development fully incorporates “Secured by Design” principles to minimise these risks, again not addressed in the Plan.

Without clear and robust design measures, the proposal risks conflicting with the objectives of the NPPF to create safe and inclusive communities.

3. Impact on Local Road Network

Secondary roads such as Rocky Lane and Frog Lane are already substandard in width and alignment. Increased traffic is likely to result in:

- Verge damage and road edge deterioration
- Increased vehicle conflicts
- Rat-running to avoid congestion on Chester Road

These impacts would degrade both safety and rural character.

4. Cumulative Impact with School and Peak Traffic

Existing congestion is already exacerbated by school-related traffic. The proposed development would introduce an estimated additional 120–180 vehicles during school peak periods, creating acute congestion spikes and safety risks near school access points.

5. Lack of Sustainable Transport Alternatives

Tattenhall has limited public transport provision and a high reliance on private vehicles. As such, the development cannot be considered sustainable in transport and environmental terms, contrary to national and local planning policy objectives.

Conclusion

The proposed development would result in a severe impact on the local highway network, particularly at the A41 junctions, leading to increased congestion, delays, and safety risks. Given that all our feeder routes are rural, with blind bends, width restrictions, high hedges, passing places and heavy agricultural traffic increasingly the traffic density will only increase the already high risk of accidents. (Currently it is estimated that 70% of all UK accidents occur on rural roads, data from NFU Mutual).

Recent appeal decisions demonstrate that highway impacts alone are sufficient to justify refusal where the residual cumulative impact would be severe. For example, the 2024 Gomm Valley appeal was dismissed solely on highway grounds, with the Inspector concluding that the development would result in severe impacts on the road network and unacceptable safety risks.

Similarly, large housing proposals have been refused where transport assessments were found to be insufficiently robust to demonstrate that impacts would not be severe.

In this case, the A41 junction is already operating under pressure, and the additional traffic generated by up to 600 dwellings would likely exceed its capacity, resulting in sustained queuing, delays, and increased safety risks. In line with established appeal decisions, this represents a severe cumulative impact and justifies refusal under the NPPE.

In its current form, the development is unsustainable and should be refused.